



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

emendation is supported by a passage from Diodorus). It is to be hoped that Professor Wendland will treat at greater length elsewhere, as he suggests that he may, the difficult and important questions of the date of the work and the amount of truth underlying the story, obviously legendary in part, of the origin of the Greek Bible. With regard to the date, Wendland, for reasons briefly stated here (pp. xxvi f.) and in the introduction to his translation of the letter in Kautzsch's *Apokryphen und Pseudepigraphen*, concludes that it falls between 96 and 63 B. C. Several of the questions put to the seventy translators by Ptolemy suggest that the rule of the Ptolemies was in its decline, the court titles (*ἀρχισωματοφύλακες* and the like) were probably the creation of the second century B. C., and the names of the seventy recall the age of the Maccabees. There are certainly good reasons for believing that Schürer's date (about 200 B. C.) is too early, as that recently proposed by Willrich (about 33 A. D., *Judaica*, pp. 118 ff.) is unquestionably too late. But the wide discrepancy between these dates shows that the question is as yet far from settled. Wendland's text is followed by a complete and carefully edited collection of the *testimonia* or allusions to the story made by Jewish and Christian writers up to the fifth century. An exhaustive index of the language, indicating parallel usages in the Septuagint and the papyri, adds to the usefulness of the volume.

H. ST. J. THACKERAY.

LONDON, ENGLAND.

EXODUS. Erklärt von LIC. DR. H. HOLZINGER. (= "Kurzer Handkommentar zum Alten Testament," herausg. von Karl Marti, Abteilung II.) Tübingen: Mohr, 1900. Pp. xx + 155. M. 3; bound, M. 4.

THE plan of this series, in excluding the publication of the Hebrew text and its translation, allows more room for the presentation and expansion of critical and exegetical material. In this thin book we find a surprising amount of matter demanding careful consideration. The *Einleitung* discusses the "content and construction," the "sources," the "editing," the "newer literature," and a tabular summary of the contents of Exodus according to their sources.

The body of the work is properly subdivided, and the matter in each minor subdivision consists of (1) compact textual notes, in which the variant readings of the important versions are cited, and also a few emendations made by the author; (2) the critical analysis of the

text, and reasonably full discussion of the differences of opinion among leading critics; and (3) an exegetical section, where in larger type there is a more or less popular discussion, though full of Greek and Hebrew words, of obscure and difficult words and portions of the text.

The author's treatment is full of interest, although he does not always arrive at a definite and satisfactory conclusion. He is not yet ready to accept any proposed explanation of the word Moses (מֹשֶׁה), not even the Egyptian *mes*, *messu* (p. 6). On the tetragrammeton (Exod. 3:14) we find a fine-print summary of the principal views hitherto set forth. Holzinger apparently follows Dillmann and derives it (יהוה) from a Qal form, with the meaning "the one who brings down," "the ruling one," possibly a weather-god, as Stade (*Gesch. Isr.*, Vol. I, p. 429, note 1). Tiele, Stade, and Budde have found the origin of Yahweh among the Kenites. But up to the present moment neither the proposed explanation of the name nor the origin of Yahweh offers any adequate explanation of the character attributed to him by the Jews.

In his analysis of the Passover and the exodus passage (Exod. 12:1—13:16) he finds remnants of every known source and several glosses (e. g., הַפֶּסַח, vs. 21, and עֵד בִּקְרָה, vs. 22). While in the main divisions he agrees with Driver, Addis, and Bacon, he still finds phrases and words that must be sundered from their connection if properly attributed to their original sources. The variants of the versions are also abundant in this section. The troublesome words translated in the margin of the Revised Version "between the two evenings" (בֵּין הָעֶרְבִים) have called out numerous explanations. The Samaritans and Karaites understood it to be the time intervening between sunset and darkness; the Pharisees and the rabbis thought it referred to the time between the first going down toward the west (about 3 o'clock) of the sun and its disappearance. The usage at the temple, and that described in the Talmud, is the latter. A similar custom is current among the Arabs at Mecca. But the Passover was a night feast, and the slaying of the lamb occurred just as the sun went down. The form of the above word is not a genuine dual, but an extension of the ending ׀. The translation would then be (similar to יוֹמָם "during the day") "within the evening time." The author has no adequate solution to give to the large number of the Israelites in 12:37, nor to the reputed length of Israel's sojourn (in vs. 40) in Egypt. The sabbath question receives discussion of especial interest; and the "Book of the Covenant" is treated through four pages of fine print—both giving largely

a summary of previous discussions. The commentary reveals, on the part of the author, great industry, good judgment in proportioning the material, and careful philological work. If there is one general criticism to be made on the work as a whole, it is that the author too often leaves the reader in doubt as to the best position in his mind on the grounds of the evidence.

IRA M. PRICE.

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO.

LE PROPHÈTE OSÉE. Par CHARLES MERCIER. Lausanne: Bridel, 1900. Pp. 123.

THIS is an admirable piece of work. M. Mercier has succeeded in making Hosea live before the eyes of his readers, and in enabling them to appreciate the sad life and the lofty faith of this ancient preacher of righteousness. Books like this, which undertakes to do for the French public what—to mention a few among many—the works of W. R. Smith, G. A. Smith, and Valeton have done for the English, Dutch, and German public, cannot fail to do an immense service in removing the popular distrust of the so-called “higher criticism.”

The author divides his discussion into two parts: (1) “The Person of Hosea,” including his life, his times, his work, and his predecessors; and (2) “The Preaching of Hosea,” dealing with the sin of Israel, as manifested in the cultus, the social and political demoralization, and the lack of the knowledge of Jehovah; and the love of God, as shown in his punishment of sin and in his appeals to repentance and his offer of salvation.

M. Mercier adopts the view of Valeton, Wellhausen, and others with regard to the narrative in chaps. 1–3. He is very conservative on the subject of editorial additions and interpolations, rejecting only 1:7 and 2:1–3 (Eng. trans., 1:10–2:1). He declines to give his assent to the theory of Kuenen that the prophets of the eighth century were the originators of “ethical monotheism.” He holds, however, that the religion of the contemporaries of Amos and Hosea was really only monolatry or at best a practical monotheism, and says that “the preaching of Amos and Hosea marks a step of great importance because that in it the national God Yahweh becomes the one God, the sovereign Judge, and the sole Ruler of the universe.”

WALTER R. BETTERIDGE..

ROCHESTER THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY.